DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 590 RC 005 001

TITLE	Michigan Housing Report: A Report of a Study Jointly Undertaken by the Migrant Research Project and the United Migrants for Opportunity, Inc.
INSTITUTION	Manpower Evaluation and Development Inst. Washington, D.C. Migrant Research Project.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	8 May 70
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Role, Civil Liberties, Federal Legislation, *Housing Deficiencies, Law Enforcement, *Legal Responsibility, *Migrant Housing, Migrant Problems, *Migrants, State Legislation
IDENTIFIERS	*Michigan

ABSTRACT

It is estimated that between 50,000 and 100,000 migrants annually go to Michigan in search of agricultural employment. Approximately 3,100 camps located through the state provide housing for these workers. Prior to the present study, the public had already been made aware of the squalid conditions in which migrants live. The purpose of this study was to document those aspects of migrant housing which could be improved by more rigorous enforcement of existing laws and regulations. Included in the document are explanations of (1) the survey method used in the study, (2) criteria for evaluating housing conditions, and (3) Federal and state laws and regulations for agricultural labor camps. Also included are tables of statistics. (EJ)

ED046590

U.S. Department of Health, Education
& Welfare
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization organizing it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

RECEIVED
JAN 27 1971
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

MICHIGAN HOUSING REPORT:
A REPORT OF A STUDY JOINTLY UNDERTAKEN BY THE MIGRANT RESEARCH PROJECT AND THE UNITED MIGRANTS FOR OPPORTUNITY, INC.

The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author and should not be construed as representing the opinions or policy of any agency of the United States Government.

Migrant Research Project (M.E.D.I.)
1329 - 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

May 8, 1970

PS 005001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Background	1
II.	Methodology of Research	2
III.	Preliminary Observations on Housing Conditions in Michigan Migrant Labor Camps	6
	Drainage	8
	Debris	9
	Recreational Area	10
	Adequate and Safe Water Supply	10
	Housing Structures	13
	Fire Safety	15
	Cooking and Eating Facilities	17
	Lighting and Wiring	18
	Heating	19
	Overcrowding	22
	Bathing Facilities	24
	Laundry Facilities	25
	Toilet Facilities	26
	Michigan Employment Security Commission Study	29
Footnotes		30

APPENDIX A - Federal and State Laws and Regulations For Agricultural Labor Camps

APPENDIX B - Percentage Tabulations of Questions on Survey Form

APPENDIX C - Inspection Sheet

MICHIGAN HOUSING STUDY

I. Background

During the summer of 1969, the Migrant Research Project, with the cooperation of the United Migrants for Opportunity, Inc.[1], conducted an intensive survey of migrant housing in the State of Michigan. Michigan was chosen because of the large number of migrant workers who enter the state each year in search of agricultural employment. It is estimated that between 50,000 to 100,000 migrants annually come to Michigan from other states, primarily Texas, in search of employment. Approximately 3,100 camps, located throughout the State of Michigan, provide housing for these workers.

Prior to this study, the public had already been informed of the substandard and squalid conditions in which migrants dwell. The recent hearings conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor held in 1969, publicity relating to the grape-pickers strike led by Cesar Chavez, and numerous books and publications had all focused attention on the plight of the migrant laborer.

The purpose of the particular study undertaken by the Migrant Research Project was to identify and document thoroughly those aspects of migrant housing which could be improved by more

rigorous enforcement of existing laws and regulations. It was believed that a major impediment to the provision of improved housing for the migrant workers was the lack of specific information and statistics on one of the most acute problems facing the migrant worker.

II. Methodology of Research

The UMOI was selected to participate in this cooperative effort because of its willingness to make available the services of its staff members and because the organization maintained offices serving migrants in the parts of the State of Michigan where migrants most commonly reside. It was believed that a more balanced geographic distribution could be obtained by making inspections in the manner chosen.

An inspection sheet was designed to enable persons, having little formal education, to report detailed information on housing conditions in an accurate and objective manner. The questions were also chosen to provide information revealing the existence of violations of the State Housing Regulations promulgated and enforced by the Michigan Department of Public Health[2] as well as Federal regulations set by the U.S. Department of Labor.[3] For the most part, the questions were drawn by simply restating the

Michigan regulations in the form of an interrogatory or question. A copy of the inspection sheet is attached in Appendix C.

It is initially important to understand the regulations set by the U.S. Department of Labor governing housing conditions for migrant workers. The regulations apply in situations where an employer seeks the assistance of the state employment agency receiving federal funds (in this case, the Michigan Employment Security Commission) in the interstate recruitment of agriculture, woods, and related industry workers. These regulations, therefore, apply with particular force to migrant workers.

According to the procedures set forth in the Federal regulations, a grower(employer) who solicits the Michigan Employment Security Commission in recruiting farm workers from outside the state must state that the labor camp which he operates conforms to the minimum housing standards. No inspection or other proof is required at that time, although an inspection of the camp is required within thirty days prior to arrival of the workers. If it is found that the grower does not meet the minimum standards, the work order will be cancelled, and the employer will be denied any further assistance from the state employment agency. This sanction, however, often involves no more than a futile gesture since the workers are already in the camp or enroute at the time

of cancellation. Consequently, the enforcement scheme poses no immediate problem to the operator: he is already guaranteed of having workers to harvest the current crop and, at the same time, is not required to make the corrections necessary to bring the camp into conformity with the minimum standards required by law.

The Federal regulations pertaining to minimum housing standards set by the U.S. Department of Labor are, as was already stated, minimum standards. The state, while prevented from enacting regulations sanctioning any lesser standards, is not required to set any higher standards. For this reason, Michigan, as most of the other states receiving federal funds for their state employment agency, departs very little from the Federal regulations. Thus, the inspection sheet, by restating the Michigan regulations in an interrogatory form, permitted an analysis of violations under both State and Federal law. (A summary of Federal and state regulations set by the Michigan Department of Public Health may be found in Appendix A.)

The inspectors who surveyed the camps in Michigan were, for the most part, employees of the UMOI. They were familiar with the locations of the camps and the set-up inside. The actual determination of the camps to be surveyed was not made by means of a random sample because a list of all the camps was not available. Nevertheless, the selections were informed

choices, ones made on the basis of information and knowledge accumulated by the UMOI staff from their extensive contacts with the migrant workers throughout the state. It should also be emphasized, however, that no attempt was made to inspect only the worst camps, nor could it be said that the most desperate migrants sought assistance at a UMOI office or that any such selection process colored the survey. In fact, if anything, the studies conducted by the UMOI show just the contrary.

By the end of the summer, 148 camps had been surveyed representing 23 counties out of a total of 68 counties on the lower peninsula. In only 45 of these 68 counties, however, are there a significant number of workers who migrate during the peak summer season.[4] The 148 camps selected housed over 5,000 migrant workers and their families, and varied considerably in size, ranging anywhere between 6 to 261 occupants. Although this represents only a small percentage of the total 3,100 camps in Michigan (approximately five per cent), it should be noted that access into the camps is exceedingly difficult. Operators or the crew leaders are generally hostile to outsiders seeking to inspect the housing facilities which are provided for the migrants.[5]

Having established the background and methodology of the study, it is now possible to proceed into a discussion of some preliminary observations concerning housing conditions in Michigan migrant labor camps, based on the data which was collected. Although it is stressed that the comments made herein are only preliminary, subject to possible further modification, they are no less based on information that was accurately recorded and well documented. For these reasons, it is felt that the credibility of the foregoing observations rests on firm foundation.

III. Preliminary Observations On Housing Conditions In Michigan Migrant Labor Camps

Under the applicable provisions of Michigan law, any migrant camp housing five or more workers must be licensed by the Agricultural Labor Camp Unit (ALCU) of the State Department of Public Health. In order to receive a license, an ACLU inspector must first visit the camp and find that it "conforms or will conform to the minimum standards of construction, health, sanitation, sewage, water supply, garbage and rubbish disposal", as well as other applicable provisions from the regulations. Upon approval and issuance, the camp owner is then required to

display his license in a "conspicuous place" within the camp area. Despite this clear standard, licenses were observed in 83 or approximately 56 per cent of the survey camps. (In only 67 of these camps was the license actually posted as required.) As will be seen below, this pattern of wholesale violation of every elementary licensing requirement is not atypical.

The remainder of the discussion on the preliminary findings will be devoted to a textual discussion of housing conditions in the migrant labor camps by specific areas of concern. The breakdown will be made under the following categories: drainage, debris, garbage disposal, recreational facilities, water supply, housing structures, fire safety, cooking and eating facilities, lighting and electricity, heating, overcrowding, bathing and shower facilities, laundry facilities and toilets. It is believed that the above breakdown is comprehensive and touches upon most all areas relevant to housing conditions. In addition to text and the statistics which are to be discussed below, a table containing the relevant figures upon which the findings are based is provided in the Appendix. Due to problems which the inspectors encountered, as discussed earlier, many of the figures are not based upon the total number of camps. Reference to Appendix B will, however, disclose the

actual number of camps studied in cases where the specific information could be obtained.

Drainage

Michigan regulations require that the camp area shall be well-drained and free from any topographical depressions in which water may stagnate. Results of the survey showed that 54 per cent of the survey camps were in violation of this provision. The responses revealed that undrained rainwater, as well as water collecting from faucets, wells, showers, laundry tubs, and septic tanks, were the primary sources of the moisture that was observed. Ditches and depressions on the camp topography further added to the problem of poor drainage.

Although standing water resulting from poor or non-existent drainage systems might on first impression appear to be of minor importance, it is a condition which encourages a large mosquito and insect population. When added to factors such as poor screening and other unsanitary conditions discussed below, this problem significantly fosters a major health problem in the camps.

Debris

51 per cent of the camps inspected were found to have debris and trash strewn about the camp area. Although the presence of debris is an admittedly subjective determination to be made by the inspectors, this finding gains considerable credence in view of the finding that 30 per cent of the camps lacked the adequate number of garbage cans as required by the regulations, while another 53 per cent indicated that the garbage cans were not properly sealed to protect against insects, rats and vermin.

Several other observations further explain the presence of the debris observed in most camps. While state regulations require that garbage be collected at least once a week, only 41 per cent of the camps complied with this requirement. Moreover, in one-third of the instances where compliance was found, it was learned that it was the migrant worker who was responsible for collecting the garbage, rather than the operator or local sanitation officials.

Recreational Area

The regulations require that "the camp shall include a space for recreation reasonably related to the size of the camp and type of occupancy." The results of the Michigan survey showed that, in 37 per cent of the camps, no recreational area was provided. This finding takes on significance when considered in conjunction with the fact that the typical migrant worker traveling to Michigan brings his family (the average household size being 6.5 members)[6] which includes many young children. While it is commonly reported that children under age 12 have been found working in the fields, it is important that when they are left by themselves, a recreational area is provided in which they may play.

Adequate and Safe Water Supply

The health regulations require that each camp have "an adequate and convenient water supply." The Procedural Manual for Sanitarians, also published by the Department of Public Health, is more specific in this respect in stating that "cisterns, springs, ponds or open streams shall not be used as a source of potable water." Yet, it is significant to point out that in 15

per cent of the camps, the inspectors found the water to be "unsafe," because of unusual, often rusty colorations of the water, unpleasant odors and excessive sediments.

The following table illustrates the extent of illegal water sources on the camps:

TABLE I:
Illegal Sources of Potable Water

(1)	Cistern, spring pond or open streams	3 camps	(2%)
(2)	Hand-pump with open top or open spout wells	47 camps	(32%)
(3)	Open top wells	8 camps	(5%)

Perhaps even more shocking is the fact that, in many cases, well water was located within 75 feet of unsanitary facilities in disregard of the provisions set forth in the Manual. The following table indicates the number of camps where wells providing drinking water were located too close to the various unsanitary facilities:

TABLE II:
Camps Where Drinking Well is Located
Within 75 Feet of Unsanitary Facilities

(1)	Privy	30 camps	(20 %)*
(2)	Septic tank	8 camps	(5%)
(3)	Till field	5 camps	(3%)
(4)	Other sewage or waste areas	16 camps	(11%)

*Percentage calculated out of total survey group.

Another indication of the inadequacy of water facilities relates to their accessibility. The regulations require that a cold water supply be located within 100 feet of each sleeping facility. Not only were 16 per cent of the camps in violation of this provision, but in only 17 per cent of instances reported was there a water source piped directly into the dwellings. Furthermore, where the water was not piped into the units, it was the migrants' responsibility to carry the water which, as was already pointed out, could be from over 100 feet away. Finally, in so far as the sufficiency of the water is concerned, 18 per cent of the camps were found to lack enough water to meet the drinking, cooking and washing needs of the migrant occupants.

The seriousness of the overall violations relating to water supply cannot be underplayed. The compounding of many violations in this category including improper and unsanitary water sources, the often distant proximity of the water supply, and the insufficiency in the amounts of water available, presents a rather bleak picture.

Housing Structures

This category includes both the type of housing provided in the camps and the structural condition of these units. Many types of housing units were seen during the course of the survey, and some camps contained several types of structures. The following table lists the kinds of units which were found, as well as the number of camps where these units were seen:

TABLE III:
Types of Housing Units Found Provided to Migrant Workers and their Families

(1)	Cabin	94 camps	(64%)*
(2)	Motel	23 camps	(16%)
(3)	Shed	6 camps	(4%)
(4)	Farmhouse	27 camps	(18%)
(5)	Barn or Garage	18 camps	(12%)
(6)	Quonset Hut	5 camps	(3%)
(7)	Bus	1 camp	(1%)
(8)	Trailer	5 camps	(3%)
(9)	Other types	7 camps	(5%)

The above figures do not, however, describe the condition of the units. Although these figures are, in themselves, most revealing, additional information contained in the following

*The percentage figures are based on the total survey group. Since various types of structures may be found on a given camp, these figures will total over 100%.

table highlights the extent of disrepair and structural unsoundness of the houses:

TABLE IV:
Structural Defects in Migrant Housing

(1)	Leaky Roofs	43 camps	(29%)
(2)	Leaky Walls	37 camps	(25%)
(3)	Rough Floors	58 camps	(39%)
(4)	Wet Floors	51 camps	(34%)
(5)	Windows do not close	30 camps	(20%)
(6)	Faulty Doors	47 camps	(32%)

To aggravate matters even further, where structural problems were found to exist, other data collected shows that little or no effort is made to make the necessary repairs. For example, the inspectors reported that broken windows are not replaced or repaired in 34 per cent of the camps. Furthermore, in the 79 camps which have screens on all of the windows and doors as the regulations require, only 50 per cent of the residents indicated that any disrepair or malfunction in this respect would be rectified.

Once again, these statistics can only be fairly appreciated when considered in conjunction with several figures cited earlier. The degree of structural unsoundness--particularly the extent of broken windows, those failing to shut, and the

lack of screening on windows and doors--cannot be regarded as providing protection against mosquitoes, other insects, and rodents. In view of the debris, puddles of water and other unsanitary conditions found to exist in the camp, these structural defects can only contribute to the generally poor health of migrant laborers, as revealed by other studies indicating that the medical problems suffered by migrants are far above the national average. For example, it has been shown that the incidence of tuberculosis and other respiratory diseases among migrants is significantly higher than for any other group and that migrant mortality rate from these diseases was nearly two and one-half times the national average.[7] It should, therefore, be emphasized that the statistics, like others presented throughout this report, have meaning apart from the figures themselves.

Fire Safety

The Michigan regulations require at least two means of escape in one-story dwellings. Nevertheless, the survey revealed that only 56 per cent of the camps had met this requirement. Furthermore, all camps are required to maintain a means for extinguishing fires. Once again, the presence of some

form of fire extinguishing equipment was found in only 49 per cent of the camps. The following chart lists the various types of fire-fighting equipment that was provided to satisfy this requirement:

TABLE V:
Types of Fire Extinguishing Equipment Found on Migrant Camps in the Survey Camps. (Basis: 72 Camps indicating that such Equipment was Provided).

(1)	Fire Extinguishers (common cannister type)	25 camps	(35%)*
(2)	Hose	36 camps	(50%)
(3)	Bucket	20 camps	(28%)
(4)	Other types	5 camps	(7%)

*Percentages listed exceed over 100%, as various types of equipment could be found on a camp.

In spite of the general lack of adequate fire safety protection in those camps where the equipment is provided, it is also noteworthy to point out that only 26 per cent of the camps comply with another regulation requiring that the extinguishers be placed within 100 feet of the unit. Had the dwellings been structurally sound and fire-safe, the situation would not be so acute, but it becomes alarming since most of the units consisted of easily ignitable wooden structures. The figures cited below regarding the cooking facilities, types of heating

components, and the condition of the lighting and wiring make the "tinder box" nature of these structures more clear.

Cooking and Eating Facilities

There are several regulations which define the broad category of cooking and eating facilities. They require that, when individual cooking is permitted in the dwelling units, "a cook stove or hot plate with not less than two burners" shall be provided. The regulations further require adequate food storage shelves and counters for preparation; mechanical refrigeration that will maintain a temperature of not more than 45 degrees Fahrenheit; and a sufficient number of tables to accommodate the capacity of the shelter.

The following observations were made with respect to the above requirements: Cooking was permitted in the individual units in 128 or in 86 per cent of the camps. In all of these dwellings a cookstove was provided. However, 20 per cent of the camps were without sufficient food storage shelves or work counters and 31 per cent lacked sufficient tables and chairs to accommodate the occupants. Another 17 per cent lacked any refrigeration whatsoever.

Although these figures might appear a bit confusing, especially in view of the 100 per cent compliance in providing

the required cookstoves as contrasted with the deficiencies in other respects, the reason for this inconsistency becomes apparent upon the presentation of one additional factor to be enumerated upon in future discussion -- i.e., overcrowding. For present purposes, however, it is important to realize that while the units themselves may contain the required pieces of equipment, the overcrowding of people into the housing units renders them generally inadequate to accommodate the large numbers that actually use the facilities. Although the licenses specify the maximum number of occupants allowed in the camp, it is noteworthy that in twenty instances the actual occupancy exceeded the licensed occupancy. In view of the fact that licenses were posted or observed in only 83 of the total survey camps, these twenty camps take on added significance.

Lighting and Wiring

Nearly all of the camps in the Michigan survey were provided with electricity. Only one camp out of the 148 group total was not electrified. The regulations, however, go far beyond the mere requirement of furnishing electricity. They specify, for instance, that there must be at least one wall plug in each room. Eighteen per cent of the camps indicated non-compliance in this respect. Whereas the yards and pathways,

privies, showers, dining halls and other common facilities are required to be adequately lighted, 62 per cent recorded violations of this provision.

Another area of serious concern involves the electrical wiring provided in dining facilities and in the homes. Seventeen camps were found to have bare wires in the various units. Furthermore, in another eighteen camps these wires were exposed to paper, cardboard and other combustible materials. In light of the deficiencies in the fire extinguishing equipment, as well as in the type of housing structures, the fire hazard which exists in the camps cannot in any way be understated.

Heating

The regulations require that shelters and commonly used rooms occupied before May 31 or after September 1 be provided with heating capable of maintaining a temperature of not less than 68 degrees Fahrenheit. Although the data presented below is limited by the sample size -- i.e., most surveys were conducted during the summer when heat was not required -- there remains a basis for concluding that the heat furnished was inadequate.

Migrant labor is used throughout the year on the lower Michigan peninsula, although peak activity comes in the summer months. The bulk of the M.R.P. survey inspections were made during the peak period between June and August. However, twenty-four inspections were made before May 31, with the earliest occurring on April 24, 1969. In sixteen of these twenty-four camps, or two-thirds of them, migrants were present.

Having seen that sizeable numbers of migrants are present in camps when there is a duty to provide heat, we can better examine the results of the overall survey which revealed that nearly 39 per cent of the camps lacked any form of heating mechanism. In a select group of 70 camps, an attempt was made to identify the type of heating system provided, and the results of this effort are presented in the following table:

TABLE VI:
Heating Systems Provided Migrant Labor Camps. (Basis: 70 camps)

(1)	Furnaces	44 camps
(2)	Electric Heaters	6 camps
(3)	Cookstoves	44 camps
(4)	Other	37 camps

Although earlier figures stated that 128 camps had been equipped with cookstoves, there may be several reasons to explain why a total of only 44 camps indicated that the stoves

were also a heating source. Variations in the type of cookstove, as well as in room size, may explain why the burners were not regarded providing sufficient heat. It is also possible that in some cases, for obvious reasons, the inspectors did not consider a cookstove as an adequate heating system.

Further analysis of the fuels used for heating illustrates but another contributing factor to often discussed fire hazards on the camps. Out of a total of 70 camps (55 per cent) where heating was provided, the inspectors reported that in only 15 per cent of those camps did the system appear to be "safe." Although this figure is open to question for its subjectivity, the following figures on fuel sources help to explain the inspectors' reports:

TABLE VII:
Fuel Sources for Heating in 70
Camps where Heating was Provided.

(1)	Kerosene	5 camps
(2)	Oil	5 camps
(3)	Coal	1 camp
(4)	Wood	9 camps
(5)	Butane	40 camps
(6)	Other	31 camps

Overcrowding

The fact that overcrowded conditions exist in the camps has been mentioned previously. One reason for this condition could lie in the fact that in nearly one-fourth of the camps the number of occupants exceeds the maximum occupancy permitted under the license. The determination of allowable occupancy is made by the Agricultural Licensing Camp Unit (ALCU) of the State Department of Public Health on the basis of square footage of living space available in all of the dwelling units combined. For example, if a camp had only two houses, the first having adequate space to house legally eight persons and the second house could accommodate only two persons, and if two families each having a household of five moved into the camp, there would be no violation of the regulations even though one family of five is living in a unit which could accommodate only two persons.

The factor of overcrowding is clearly evidenced from the shortage of available bed space. Table VIII, based on statistics obtained from 55 camps, shows that in a majority of instances, more than two persons sleep in a single bed.

TABLE VIII:
Average Number of Persons Sleeping in One Bed. (Basis: 55 Camps)

One to Two Persons	14 camps
Two persons	12 camps
Two to Three Persons	9 camps
Three Persons	9 camps
Four or more Persons	13 camps

Furthermore, in 68 per cent of the camps surveyed, it was learned that children over six years old are sleeping in the same room with their parents, contrary to the regulations which specifically provide that "a family having one or more children over six years of age shall have a partitioned sleeping area for the husband and the wife." In 34 camps, the children sleep in the same bed with their parents. While it is not within the confines of this report to discuss the psychological ramifications of overcrowding and lack of privacy, it should suffice to say that these conditions hold the potential for creating serious problems in the future.

While the figures presented above may already appear somewhat disconcerting, it should be realized that migrants regard the opportunity of sleeping in a bed a privilege. Indeed, in 33 camps in the survey, migrants had nowhere else to sleep except in their automobiles or on the floors.

The regulations broadly state that there be "sufficient bed space consisting of comfortable, rigidly supported beds, cots or bunks." The array of statistics clearly suggests that this requirement has not been met by the operators.

Bathing Facilities

The work of the migrant worker is spent largely in the fields, being exposed to dust, dirt and pesticides, some of which may be harmful to his health. In spite of this fact, 30 per cent of the camps were found to be without bathing facilities of any sort. In the 94 camps where bathing facilities were available, only 65 had hot and cold water under pressure. Additional potential violations were recorded in 24 camps in this group because the facilities were located over 200 feet from the dwelling units. More than half of the 94 camps had less than one shower head for each 15 persons as the regulations shall also require. Furthermore, the inspectors found that, in a significant number of camps, the facilities were in an unsanitary condition.

Nearly half of the 94 camps with bathing facilities did not have sufficient space for dressing and changing, adding further credence to the factor of overcrowding. Furthermore,

as in the case of garbage disposal, it was found that the migrants were often responsible for making the collection. In 42 camps where it was possible to gather information on this subject, 95 per cent of the respondents indicated that the migrant was charged with the responsibility.

The regulations pertaining to adequate bathing facilities do not go into effect until January 1, 1971, although they do apply with respect to any camp built after July 1, 1969. Thus, while the information collected fails to show present violations of the regulations, nonetheless, it does demonstrate inadequate and unsanitary bathing facilities presently do exist.

Laundry Facilities

Due to the nature of the migrant's work in the field, as well as the debris and unsanitary conditions existing in the camps, their clothing becomes considerably soiled and dirty. Nevertheless, only 40 per cent of the camps provided a place to wash clothes. Of this group, only half of the camps were supplied with hot and cold running water. Many camps lacked an ample number of tubs, trays or, in a few instances, washers.

Once again, the regulations relating to adequate laundry facilities do not go into effect until January 1, 1971, except

for those camps constructed after June 1, 1969. Although they will require that laundry facilities be available, that they be supplied with hot and cold running water under pressure, and lay down specific ratios governing the number of tubs and trays per adult occupant, this new regulation has little bearing on the immediate problem. There is also little reason, based on past history and experience, to believe that the camp operators will take voluntary steps to fulfill these requirements ahead of schedule, especially where there are so many violations in those areas where the regulations are now in force.

Toilet Facilities

Toilets pose one of the greatest health hazards in the camp. Only 22 per cent of the survey camps indicated that a toilet was provided for each of the housing units. In these, and in the remaining camps, common privy facilities were provided. The common privy facility is, typically, the outhouse. The regulations specify that where central facilities exist, a toilet or privy seat shall be provided for each sex in a ratio of at least one unit for each fifteen adults. A urinal may be substituted for a toilet seat in the case of male adults. Only 56 per cent of the camps indicated compliance with this provision.

In approximately one-half of the camps there were no separate facilities for men and women, also contrary to the regulations. Other violations pertaining to inadequate or unsanitary toilet facilities under the Public Health regulations are listed on the following table:

TABLE IX:
Miscellaneous Violations Pertaining
to Toilet Facilities

Violation	No. of Camps
(1) Poorly lighted	118 camps (80%)
(2) Inadequately ventilated	102 camps (69%)
(3) Toilet paper and holders not provided	106 camps (72%)
(4) Privies are not fly tight	93 camps (63%)
(5) Privy closer than 50 feet to dwelling or cooking unit	57 camps (39%)
(6) Nearest privy located over 200 feet from the living unit	26 camps (18%)

The regulations also require that the toilets be "impervious and maintained in clean condition." The inspectors found this in only 35 per cent of the camps. Perhaps a reason for the lack of cleanliness is due to the failure to annually lime the pits. Only 20 camps indicated that this procedure had been done.

Once again, these violations should be considered in conjunction with deficiencies observed in other aspects of migrant housing. For example, the fact that the privies were not adequately sealed against flies in 93 camps takes on added meaning in view of the puddles and dampness, the debris and garbage, and other unsanitary conditions which further encourage the likelihood of large insect populations. When weighed against the figures on the number of broken windows, windows which fail to close, faulty doors and lack of screening, this leaves the migrant with very little protection.

The issue of who is charged with the responsibility for maintaining the standards set forth in the Public Health regulations has been mentioned several times throughout this discussion. Once again, the same question was raised as it specifically related to the cleaning of privy facilities. Out of a total of 79 responding camps, 82 per cent stated that this responsibility rested with the migrant. Furthermore, in 48 camps where the question was posed, 58 per cent indicated that the migrants dug the pits for the outhouses.

Michigan Employment Security Commission Study

It was learned that of the 148 camps surveyed, 14 of them were believed to house migrants who had been recruited through the Michigan Employment Security Commission. The legal significance of this method of recruitment was discussed earlier. When an employer seeks the assistance of the State employment agency, the Federal regulations on minimum housing standards set forth by the U.S. Department of Labor must be met. Basically, these are exactly the same as the state regulations enunciated by the Michigan Department of Public Health.

It is highly noteworthy to point out that these 14 camps averaged 13.8 violations per camp, in contrast to 15.3 violations for the overall survey. This indicates that when the camps come under the jurisdiction of Federal regulations, the conditions appear to be somewhat better. Since the standards and enforcement mechanisms are virtually the same, the better showing of the federally regulated camps can be attributed to the slightly more effective sanctions available against growers using the federal system.

Footnotes

1. The United Migrants For Opportunity, Inc. (UMOI) is a private non-profit corporation funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity under Title III-B. The UMOI was organized to provide a variety of social services to migratory and seasonal farmworkers in Michigan.

2. R.325.1501-15. These regulations were promulgated by the Department of Public Health pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws, § S 286.621 - 286.633. The Act sets forth the conditions governing the granting of a license to an operator of any agricultural labor camp occupied by five or more workers and their dependents. The criteria for determining whether or not a license shall be granted is set forth in the regulations. Any further reference in the text to either the licensing provisions or the regulations may be found in the above sections.

3. 20 CFR 602.9(d).

4. The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States-1969 Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare made by its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor pursuant to S. Res. 222, p. 120 /Hereinafter cited as 1969 Report/. The table appearing here lists those counties having approximately 100 or more seasonal agricultural workers and family dependents that migrated into Michigan during 1967-68. 20 of the 23 counties in the survey appeared on the list.

5. For a more thorough discussion on the issue of access into migrant labor camps, see Spriggs, "Access of Visitors to Labor Camps on Privately Owned Property," 21 U. of Fla. L. Rev. 295 (1967).

6. 1969 Report, p. 11. This figure is the average household size for migrant households in Texas, the home base state for the bulk of Michigan's migrant population.

7. Migrant Health Program-Current Operational and Additional Needs, prepared for the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, December, 1967, p. 15. This report contains a wealth of valuable statistics concerning the grave health problems confronting migrant workers and their dependents.

APPENDIX A

Federal and State Laws and Regulations For Agricultural Labor Camps

Both the Federal Government and the State of Michigan have promulgated housing standards to be met by the operators of agricultural labor camps.

A. Federal Standards

The Federal involvement with migrant workers' housing problems has been one of long-standing interest and little action. Recommendations for action have been made by Presidents' Commissions and Interagency Committees since 1946.[1] By 1956, President Eisenhower's Committee on Migratory Labor had issued a draft housing code as a guide for State employment agencies, farmers and civic groups in their efforts to secure voluntary improvements.[2] Finally, in 1968, compliance with these standards

---

[1] A work group of the Federal Interagency Committee on Migratory Labor, appointed in 1946, developed a bill granting authority to state labor commissioners to regulate labor camps, and suggested language for a labor camp code. The President's Commission on Migratory Labor, appointed in 1950, made recommendations in 1951 for improvement of housing and other conditions of migratory farm labor. "Housing for Migrant Agricultural Workers: Labor Camp Standards," Bulletin 235, United States Department of Labor (November 1962), p. 3.

[2] Id. at 3-4.

was made a condition of access to the interstate recruitment facilities of the United States Training and Employment Service (USTES).[3]

The actual standards are considered minimal, and are so designated in the language of the regulations. They are applied to deny interstate recruitment only to growers in states whose codes are less stringent.[4] They are, for the most part, supplanted by Michigan's regulations, which are comparable and, in a few instances, more stringent.[5]

To appreciate the impact of the Federal policy, it is necessary to review the procedures for interstate recruitment. Early each year growers apply to offices of the Michigan Employment Security Commission (MESC) for work orders, specifying the

---

[3] 20 CFR § 602.9, 620.1, et seq. USTES is the successor to the former Bureau of Employment Security of the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor.

[4] 20 CFR § 620.1(b).

[5] Michigan regulations are published in booklet form, and may be obtained from the Michigan Department of Public Health, Agricultural Labor Camp Unit, Division of Engineering. The Federal and Michigan standards vary in their detailed specifications for certain items. In some instances, the Federal standards are more stringent; for example, the Federal minimum standard for the dimensions of windows to be available as fire exits specifies a larger window than the Michigan Rule. Compare Rule 325.1508 with 20 CFR § 620.17. Our conversations with USTES officials in Washington confirm that USTES policy is that both sets of regulations are to be used by inspectors, who are directed to apply the stricter standard for each item.

type of work and the number of workers required, and certifying that the housing provided is in compliance with the regulations. Most of these orders are placed during the first four months of the year. Once approved, the orders are forwarded to the central State office of the MESC in Detroit, and from there to the corresponding offices in the "supply States." No order may be cleared by a local office until a housing form has been signed by an authorized inspector and by an MESC official approving the inspection. Variances may be obtained only from the USTES Regional Administrator in Chicago, only where livable space would otherwise be wasted and "appropriate alternative measures have been taken to protect the health and safety of the employee. . . ."[6]

---

[6]The conditions, more fully stated, are that the "extent of the variation is clearly specified," and that the Regional Administrator is satisfied that:

> ". . . (1) such variation is necessary to obtain a beneficial use of an existing facility, (2) the variation is necessary to prevent a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship, and (3) appropriate alternative measures have been taken to protect the health and safety of the employee and assure that the purpose of the provisions from which variation is sought will be observed." 20 CFR § 620.3(a).

In practice, the Federal policy is not effectuated. Local MESC officials make some inspections on their own, but usually rely on the work of State and local inspectors. USTES approval of an inspection involves no more than a cursory review, based on the inspector's own statement of his findings.[7] The USTES Regional Administrator may grant a variance without requiring a statement of the "alternative measures" promised by the camp operator, as is required. No very systematic effort is made to see that these promises are kept. If facilities are not maintained during the season, there are no effective penalties levied against camp operators. If a violation is reported, the MESC may cancel an employer's work order; but by the time this has occurred, the work has been advertised for some time, and needy workers are likely to arrive despite the cancellation.

The initial inspection then, almost entirely determines the efficacy of the Federal policy, and the Federal officials here readily delegate their duties.

---

[7] Prior to 1970, MESC officials relied exclusively on the work of inspectors employed by the Michigan Department of Public Health or county and local agencies. This year, until mid-April, MESC officials accompanied Michigan inspectors pursuant to a USTES effort to secure better enforcement of the housing standards. This practice has been discontinued; however, MESC officials will make spot-checks on camps housing workers recruited through USTES facilities.

B. Michigan Standards

All of Michigan's migrant labor camps are governed by the general provisions of Public Act 289 of 1965, and by the regulations promulgated in 1969 by the Department of Public Health. These regulations, as noted, also constitute the standard of eligibility for Federal recruitment.

Each camp must be inspected annually, and a permanent or temporary license is granted upon a finding that a camp and its "proposed operation . . . conforms or will conform" to the "minimum standards" set forth in the rules.[8]

Licenses may be suspended or revoked when violations are discovered.[9] For several reasons, revocation procedures afford no real protection to the workers. First, most camps are inspected only once a year, before the season of occupancy. This casts the burden upon the workers to complain of deficiencies not apparent to an inspector visiting an empty camp, or deteriorations related to occupancy which are, nonetheless, the legal responsibility of the camp operator.[10] Many workers simply do not know the procedures

---

[8] Michigan Compiled Laws § 286.624.

[9] Michigan Compiled Laws § 286.627.

[10] Rule 325.1505 assigns responsibilities to camp operators and occupants. The division is not as sharp as it may appear at first, as may be seen by reading several of the rules, together with this one.

for complaining. Most of them are Mexican-Americans, unable to read the licenses posted in the camps, which are in English. Being away from their own homes, the workers cannot take the proprietary attitude toward local governmental institutions that resident citizens have. They also fear, for good reason, that seeking redress through local law enforcement or public health officials will cost them their jobs.

Again, where a complaint is made, the camp operator may demand a hearing with ten days' notice, and may appeal an adverse ruling to the courts. Since the workers stay in one place only for a period of weeks, sub-standard conditions may well persist until the work is finished and the workers move on.[11]

Finally, it would seldom be in the workers' interest to have a camp closed in mid-season, since it would burden them with finding new housing and, often, new employment.

---

[11] Michigan Compiled Laws § 286.627. Section 286.632 now authorizes the State Health Commissioner, through the Attorney General, to sue for injunctions against the operation of camps whose licenses have been revoked or suspended. House Bill 4362, pending at this writing in the Michigan legislature, would allow such actions to be brought, without the assistance of the Attorney General, against camp operators who have never been licensed, as well as those who have lost their licenses. The proposal, clearly a worthy one, does not address the key problem of delay.

The basic legislation provides that violation of its provisions, or of the regulations, is a misdemeanor.[12] Still, although statistics are not now available, the experience of people active in the field of farm workers' problems is that prosecutions are rarely brought, and that convictions rarely result in the sort of sentence that could deter future violations. A recalcitrant operator would find it far cheaper to pay fines, even year after year, than to make the needed improvements in his housing.[13]

The remaining available remedy would involve greater reliance on civil actions for damages or injunctive relief against the camp operators. However, migrants cannot afford the legal fees, nor can they remain for the duration of the litigation without foregoing needed employment at other areas. Similarly, they could not return as witnesses in such litigation from their distant homes during periods when they have little income.

Thus, Michigan's policy, like that of the Federal system, must rely almost totally upon the stringency of the inspections in order to effectively enforce the housing regulations.

---

[12] Michigan Compiled Laws § 286.633.

[13] In a 1968 case in Grand Traverse County, a grower was fined $35.00 for operating a camp without a license. In Antrim County, a grower who pleaded guilty on two counts was fined $75.00 and sentenced to 90 days in jail, but the jail sentence was suspended. Not surprisingly, there appear to be no cases in which growers have actually served time for violations, however egregious.

Appendix B

Percentage Tabulations of Questions on Survey Form

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
cupied Camps								
Are farm workers living in the camps now?	132	89%	92%	12	8%	8%	4	3%
censes								
Did you see the license for the camp?	83	56%	59%	57	39%	41%	8	5%
Is the license posted for all to see?	67	45%	58%	48	32%	42%	33	23%
rainage								
Is the camp well-drained?	80	54%	56%	64	43%	44%	4	3%
(a) When it is not raining, are there water or wet areas on the ground?	64	43%	48%	68	46%	52%	16	11%
(b) Sources of water:								
Rain	41	28%	64%*					
Well	8	5%	13%*					
Faucets	26	18%	41%*					

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
Dishwasher	9	6%	14%*					
Showers	15	10%	23%*					
Laundry	13	9%	20%*					
Toilet	6	4%	9%*					
Ditch	27	18%	42%*					
Drainpipe	5	3%	8%*					

* Percentages calculated on 64 camps answering "Yes" to 5(a).

Debris & Noxious Plants

6. Is there junk or trash in the camp area?	75	51%	54%	64	43%	46%	9	6%
7. (a) Is there the proper number of garbage cans in the camp area?	83	56%	65%	44	30%	35%	21	14%
(b) Are the cans tightly covered?	29	20%	27%	79	53%	73%	40	27%
8. How often is the garbage collected?	(110)	(74%)					(38)	(26%)
More than twice per week	2	1%	2%*					
Twice per week	8	5%	7%*					
Once per week	35	24%	32%*					
Less than once a wk.	28	19%	23%*					
Don't know	37	25%	34%					

* Percentages based on 110 camps.

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
9. Who collects the garbage?	(60)	(41%)					(88)	(59%)
Migrant	20	14%	33%*					
Local government	3	2%	5%*					
Grower-operator-fieldman	37	25%	62%*					

* Percentages based on 60 camps.

10. Are there poisonous plants or poisonous weeds in the camp area?	16	11%	11%	127	86%	89%	5	3%
Recreational Areas								
11. Is there a play area in the camp?	87	59%	61%	55	37%	39%	6	4%
Water Supply								
12. Is there enough water to meet the drinking, cooking, and washing needs of the camp?	117	79%	82%	26	18%	18%	5	3%
13. Is the water safe to drink?	111	75%	83%	22	15%	17%	15	10%
14. Sources of drinking water: (a) Cistern, spring, or open pond	3	2%	3%	113	76%	97%	32	22%

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
(b) Hand pump with open top or open spout	47	32%	36%	82	55%	64%	19	13%
(c) Open top well	8	5%	7%	112	76%	93%	28	19%
15. Is a drinking well located within 75 feet of any of the following:								
(a) Privy	30	20%	24%	97	66%	76%	21	14%
(b) Septic tank	8	5%	6%	117	79%	94%	23	16%
(c) Till field	5	3%	4%	120	81%	96%	23	16%
(d) Other sewage or liquid waste draining into the soil	16	11%	12%	110	74%	88%	22	15%
16. Is dwelling unit more than 100 feet from the closest cold water?	23	16%	17%	116	78%	83%	9	6%
17. Is running water piped into each place where people live?	25	17%	18%	116	78%	82%	7	5%
18. Do workers have to carry their own water?	86	58%	78%	24	16%	22%	38	26%

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
Housing Structures								
19. Types of housing units provided:								
(a) Cabin	94	64%						
(b) Motel	23	16%						
(c) Shed	6	4%						
(d) Farmhouse	27	18%						
(e) Barn or Garage	18	12%						
(f) Quonset hut	5	3%						
(g) Bus	1	1%						
(h) Trailer	5	3%						
(i) Other	7	5%						
20. Condition of the Housing Units:								
(a) Does the roof leak?	43	29%	31%	95	64%	69%	10	7%
(b) Do the walls leak?	37	25%	28%	97	66%	72%	14	9%
(c) Is the floor smooth?	79	54%	68%	44	39%	32%	11	7%
(d) Do the floors get wet?	51	34%	40%	76	52%	60%	21	14%
(e) Can the walls be easily cleaned?	68	46%	51%	66	45%	49%	14	9%
(f) Do all the windows close?	102	69%	77%	30	20%	23%	16	11%

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
(g) Are broken windows replaced or repaired?	80	55%	61%	51	34%	39%	17	11%
(h) Are the doors solid and opened easily?	85	57%	64%	47	32%	36%	16	11%
(i) Are there screens on all open windows and doors?	79	53%	60%	53	36%	40%	16	11%
(j) Are the screens in good condition?	36	24%	47%	40	27%	53%	72	49%
Fire Safety								
21. Do all units have at least 2 fire exits?	83	56%	57%	62	42%	43%	3	2%
22. Fire Extinguishing Equipment: (a) Is there a way to put out fires?	72	49%	53%	65	44%	47%	11	7%
(b) If so, what equipment is provided:								
Extinguishers	25	17%	35%*					
Hose	36	24%	50%*					
Bucket	20	14%	28%*					
Other	5	3%	7%*					

* Percentages calculated on 72 camps answering "Yes" to 7(a).

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
23. Is the equipment placed within 100 feet of each house?	38	76%	58%	28	31%	42%	20	43%
Cooking & Eating Facilities								
24. Are the workers or families allowed to cook in the housing units?	128	86%	98%	3	3%	2%	17	11%
25. Are the units provided with the following:								
(a) Cookstove with at least 2 burners	128	86%	96%	6	5%	4%	14	9%
(b) Food storage shelves and work counters	104	70%	78%	29	20%	22%	15	10%
(c) working refrigerator	106	72%	81%	25	17%	19%	17	11%
(d) Sufficient tables and chairs for the family	76	60%	57%	38	31%	43%	14	9%
(e) adequate ventilation	81	55%	61%	31	34%	39%	16	11%

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
Lighting and wiring								
26. Is electricity furnished in all of the housing units?	143	96%	99%	1	1%	1%	4	3%
27. Is there at least one wall plug in each room?	104	70%	79%	27	18%	21%	17	11%
28. Is lighting provided in yards, pathways to privies, showers, dining halls, and other common use areas?	42	29%	31%	92	62%	69%	14	9%
29.(a) Are there bare electrical wires?	17	11%	14%	108	73%	86%	23	16%
(b) Are they exposed to paper, cardboard, or other materials that burn easily?	18	12%	21%	66	45%	79%	64	43%
30. Does the family have to pay for the electricity?	13	9%	15%	71	48%	85%	64	43%

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
Heating								
31.(a) Is heating provided in the houses?	70	47%	55%	57	39%	45%	21	14%
(b) If so, what kind is used?								
Cookstoves	44	31%	63%*					
Electric heater	6	4%	9%*					
Furnace	4	3%	6%*					
Other	16	11%	23%*					
32. Is the heating system safe?	18	12%	26%*	40	27%	57%*	12	17%*
33. Heating fuels: What kinds of fuels are used in the heating system:								
(a) Kerosene	5	3%	7%*					
(b) Oil	5	3%	7%*					
(c) Coal	1	1%	1%*					
(d) Wood	9	6%	13%*					
(e) Butane	40	27%	57%*					
(f) Other	1	1%	1%*					

* Percentages based on 70 camps.

* Percentages based on 70 camps answering "Yes" to 31(a).

* Percentages based on 70 camps answering "Yes" to 31(a).

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
Overcrowding								
34. In houses for families with children over 6, must children sleep in the same room as their parents?	101	67%	70%	44	30%	30%	3	2%
35. Must children sleep with their parents?	34	23%	39%	53	36%	61%	61	41%
36. Average number of people sleeping in a single bed:	(55)	(37%)					(93)	(63%)
1-2 per bed	14	9%	25%*					
2 per bed	12	8%	22%*					
2-3 per bed	9	6%	16%*					
3 per bed	9	6%	16%*					
4 or more per bed	13	9%	24%*					
37. Must people sleep on floors or in cars?	33	22%	26%	95	64%	74%	20	14%
Bathing Facilities								
38. Are bathing facilities provided?	94	66%	68%	44	27%	32%	10	7%

* Percentages based on 55 camps.

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
39. If bathing facilities are provided: (a) Do they have hot and cold water under pressure?	65	44%	74%	23	15%	26%	6	6%*
(b) Are they clean and sanitary?	58	39%	70%	26	18%	30%	10	11%*
(c) Are they within 200 feet of each house?	67	45%	85%	12	8%	15%	15	16%*
(d) If showers are provided, are there the required number of heads per adult occupant?	48	32%	62%	30	20%	38%	16	16%*
(e) If a central shower building is used, is there adequate dressing space?	50	34%	57%	33	22%	43%	11	6%*
(f) Are hooks for clothes provided?	26	18%	46%	30	20%	54%	38	40%*
(g) Are there stools or benches to sit on?	21	14%	40%	31	21%	60%	42	45%*
(h) Separate facilities: If central showers are used, are there separate areas for men and women?	61	41%	80%	15	10%	20%	18	19%*

* Percentages calculated on the basis of 94 camps answering "Yes" to 38.

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
40. Who cleans the shower rooms:	(42)	(45%)*					.(52)	(55%)*
Migrants	40	43%*	95%**					
Owners	2	2%*	5%**					

* Based on 94 camps
**Based on 42 camps

Laundry Facilities

41. Is there a place to wash clothes?	59	40%	44%	74	50%	56%	15	10%
(a) Are the facilities provided with hot and cold running water?	29	20%	59%	20	14%	41%	10	17%*
(b) Is there a sufficient number of tubs, trays and washers?	40	27%	68%	19	13%	32%	0	0%

* Based on 59 camps.

Toilet Facilities

42. Does each family have its own toilet in the housing unit?	32	22%	23%	107	72%	77%	9	6%
43. Is there a sufficient number of flush toilets or urinals?	83	56%	65%	45	30%	35%	20	14%
44. Are there separate toilets for men and women?	78	53%	62%	48	32%	38%	22	15%

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
Toilet Facilities (cont'd)								
45. Are the toilets well-lighted?	25	17%	17%	118	80%	83%	5	3%
46. Are the toilets well ventilated?	41	28%	29%	102	69%	71%	5	3%
47. Are toilet paper and holders provided?	34	23%	24%	106	72%	76%	8	5%
48. If there are privies, are they fly tight?	35	24%	27%	93	62%	73%	20	14%
49. Is there any privy closer than 50 feet to a housing unit?	57	39%	44%	72	48%	56%	19	13%
50. Are all living units within 200 feet of the nearest toilet?	113	76%	81%	27	18%	19%	9	6%
51. Are the toilets and privies clean?	52	35%	38%	84	57%	62%	12	8%
52. Who cleans the toilets and privies?	(82)	(55%)					(66)	(45%)
(a) Migrants	68	46%	83%*					
(b) Owner	1	1%	1%*					
(c) No one	13	9%	16%*					

* Based on 82 camps.

Question	Yes	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	No	% of Total Camps	% of Responding Camps	Non-Responses	% of Non-Responses
Toilet Facilities (cont'd)								
53. Are the pits limed each year?	20	14%	28%	57	38%	72%	71	48%
54. Are the pits less than 1 foot deep?	6	4%	46%	7	5%	54%	135	91%
55. Who digs the new pits?	(48)	(32%)					100	68%
(a) Migrants	29	20%	60%*					
(b) Owners	19	12%	40%*					
MESC Camps								
56. If the workers were recruited from outside the state, who recruited them?	(137)	(93%)					(11)	(7%)
(a) MESC	14	9%	10%					
(b) Large company recruiter	33	22%	24%					
(c) Crew chief	39	26%	28%					
(d) Free wheeler	24	16%	18%					
(e) Returns each year	24	16%	18%					
(f) Other	3	2%	2%					

* Based on 48 camps

APPENDIX C

Inspection Sheet

Please answer as many questions as possible.

Inspector's Name _____ Date Inspected _____

Inspector's Phone Number _____

Name of Camp _____ Owner's Name _____

Location of camp: _____
Be as specific as possible so a stranger could find it. County Nearest Town

Nearest Street Name and Number _____ Direction and Distance from nearest town _____

1. Are farm workers living in the camp now? Yes No

2. Did you see the license or permit for the camp? Yes No

   (a) Is it posted for all to see in the camp: Yes No

   (b) How many people does the license say can live in the camp? _____

   (c) What is the license number of the camp? _____

   (d) How many people do you think can live in the camp? _____

3. How many people in this camp are 12 years or older? _____

   How many people are under 12 years old? _____

CAMP AREA

4. Is the Camp well drained? (That is, free from swampy areas where mosquitoes can breed.) Yes No

5. When it is not raining, is there water or wet areas on the ground? Yes No
Is Yes, is this from: (make check marks)

rain ( ) dish water ( ) laundry ( )
the well ( ) septic tank ( ) toilets ( )
water faucets ( ) showers ( ) ditch ( )
drain pipe ( )

6. Is there junk or trash in the camp area? Yes No

7. Number of garbage cans in the camp area? _____
(a) Are they tightly covered? Yes No
(b) How often is garbage collected: (check one)

twice a week? ( ) once a week? ( )
more than twice a week? ( ) less than once a week? ( )
don't know ( )

8. Who collects the garbage?_____

9. Are there poisonous plants or poisonous weeds in the camp area? Yes No

10. Is there a play area? Yes No

WATER SUPPLY

11. Is there enough water to meet the drinking, cooking, and washing needs in the camp? Yes No

12. Is the water safe to drink? Yes No
If No, why don't you think so_____

_____

_____

13. Does drinking water come from any of the following
(a) cistern, spring, pond or open stream? Yes No
(b) hand pump with open top or open spout? Yes No
(c) open top well? Yes No

14. Is any well located within 75 feet of any of the following:

(a)	privy?	Yes	No
(b)	septic tank?	Yes	No
(c)	tile field?	Yes	No
(d)	other sewage or liquid waste draining into the soil?	Yes	No

15. Is any home more than 100 feet from the closest cold water? Yes No

If Yes, how far is it?_____

16. Is running water piped into each place where people live? Yes No

17. Do workers have to carry their own water? Yes No

HOUSING

18. Type (s) of housing units provided:

Type	Number of separate structures	Approximate outside measurement of each unit
Cabin (small house)		
Motel		
Number of separate living Units		
Shed		
Farm House		
Number of rooms		
Barn or garage		
Quonset (metal) hut		
Chicken House		
Bus		
Trailer		
Other (please explain		

19. (a) Does the roof leak? Yes No
(b) Do the walls leak? Yes No
(c) Is the floor safe? Yes No
(d) Is the floor smooth? Yes No
(e) Do the floors get wet? Yes No
If yes, where does the water come from? _____

_____

(f) Can the walls be easily cleaned? Yes No
(g) Do all windows close? Yes No
(h) Are broken windows replaced or repaired? Yes No
(i) Are doors solid and do they open easily? Yes No
(j) Are there screens on all windows and open doors? Yes No
(k) Are they fixed? Yes No
(l) Other problems you saw: _____

_____

_____

_____

20. Do all units have at least two ways to get out in case of fire?
(One may be a window big enough to crawl through--24x24 inches and not more than 3½ feet from the floor.) Yes No

21. Is there a way to put out fires?
(a) How?
(1) fire extinguishers ( ) (3) bucket ( )
(2) hose ( ) (4) other ( )
explain_____
(b) Are they kept for this reason within 100 feet of each house? Yes No

22. Is the worker or family allowed to cook and eat in his house? Yes No
If Yes, are the following provided:
(a) Cookstove with at least 2 burners? Yes No
(b) Food storage shelves and work counter? Yes No
(c) Working refrigerator? Yes No
(d) Enough tables and chairs for the family? Yes No
(e) Adequate ventilation? Yes No

23. Is electricity furnished in all the homes? Yes No

24. Is there at least one wall plug in each room? Yes No

25. Is lighting provided for yard pathways to privies, showers, dining hall, etc.? Yes No

26. Are there bare electrical wires? Yes No
Are they exposed to paper, cardboard, or other materials that burn easily? Yes No
Does family have to pay electricity? Yes No
If Yes, is there a light meter? Yes No

27. Is there a place for hanging and storing clothes in each home? Which? (check) Yes No
(1) closets ( ) (3) pipe ( )
(2) ropes in living area ( ) (4) hooks ( )
(5) other _____

28. In houses for families with children over 6 years old, must children sleep in the same room as their parents? Yes No
Average number of people per bed. _____

29. Do people have to sleep on the floor or in cars? Yes No
Must children sleep with their parents? Yes No
Average number of people per bed _____

HEATING

30. How are the houses heated?
(a) cookstove ( ) (d) open fire ( )
(b) electric heater ( ) (e) nothing ( )
(c) furnace ( ) (f) other ( )

31. When do workers arrive in camp? _____
When do they leave? _____

32. Is the heating system safe? Yes No
If No, why don't you think so? _____

_____

(a) Kind of fuel used:
kerosene ( ) charcoal ( ) paper ( )
oil ( ) wood ( ) cooking stove ( )
coal ( ) butane gas ( ) other ( ) _____

BATHING AND LAUNDRY

33. Are bathing facilities provided? (only showers, bath tubs, or large metal tubs are acceptable) Yes No

34. If bathing facilities are provided:
    (a) Do they have hot and cold water under pressure? Yes No
    (b) Are they clean and sanitary? Yes No
    (c) Are they within 200 feet of each house? Yes No
        If No, how far must people living in the farthest house walk to get to them?_____
    (d) If showers are provided, how many shower heads are there? _____
    (e) If central shower buildings are used, is there adequate space for dressing? Yes No
    (f) Are there hooks for clothes? Yes No
    (g) Are there stools or benches to sit on? Yes No
    (h) If central shower buildings are used, are there separate shower rooms for men and women? Yes No
    (i) Who cleans the shower room? Migrants ( )
        Paid Migrants ( ) Owner ( )

35. Is there a place to wash clothes? Yes No
    Does it have hot and cold running water? Yes No
    How many wash tubs are there? _____

    How many laundry trays are there? _____

    How many working mechanical washers are there? _____

TOILETS

36. Does each family have their own toilet? Yes No

37. If toilets are shares:
    (a) Number of privy seats . . . . . _____
    (b) Number of flush toilets . . . . . _____
    (c) Are there separate toilets for men and women? Yes No
    (d) Number of Urinals . . . . . _____

38. Are toilets well lighted? Yes No

39. Are toilets well ventilated? Yes No

40. Are toilet paper and holders provided? Yes No

41. If there are privies, are the pits fly tight? Yes No

42. Is any privy closer than 50 feet to any house? Yes No
    If Yes, how far is it to the nearest toilet? _____

43. Are all living units within 200 feet of the nearest toilet? Yes No
    If No, how far is it to the nearest toilet? _____

44. Are toilets and privies clean? Yes No

45. Who cleans them? Migrants ( ) Paid Migrants ( )
Owner ( )

46. Are pits limed each year? Yes No

47. How deep is the pit? _____

48. Who digs new pits? _____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

49. If the workers are from out of state, how were they recruited?

State Employment agency	( )	Free Wheeler	( )
Large Company Recruiter	( )	Returns each year	
Crew Chief	( )	to each grower	( )
		Other (explain)	_____

_____

50. List any charges made by the camp operator to the occupants. (for example, maintenance, upkeep, gas, rent, electricity, showers, blankets, bedding, gloves, aprons, boots, etc.)